arXiv:1212.0885v2 [math.GT] 24 Feb 2013

Smoothing discrete Morse theory

Bruno Benedetti *
Dept. Mathematics, KTH Stockholm
`brunoben@kth.se`

February 24, 2013

Abstract

We survey the relation between Morse theory and its discretization by Forman. We show that PL handlebody theory and discrete Morse theory are equivalent, in the sense that every discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation is also a PL handle vector, and conversely, every PL handle vector is also a discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation. It follows that for smooth manifolds of dimension ≤ 7, classical Morse theory and discrete Morse theory *on PL triangulations* are equivalent. ("Every Morse vector is also a discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation, and vice versa.")

Some new consequences of our work are:

(1) The Heegaard genus of 3-manifolds can be characterized as the smallest g for which some triangulation of the manifold has discrete Morse vector $(1, g, g, 1)$.

(2) The Mazur 4-manifold has no locally constructible triangulation. (This answers a question by Živaljevič.)

(3) Some non-PL 5-spheres admit discrete Morse functions with only 2 critical faces. (This completes the Sphere Theorem by Forman.)

Contents

1 Triangulations **5**
1.1 The Poincaré conjecture 5
1.2 All smooth manifolds can be PL triangulated 6
1.3 Not all PL triangulations come from smooth structures 6
1.4 Lack of (PL) triangulations 7
1.5 The case of 4-manifolds 9

2 From smooth manifolds to PL handle decompositions, and backwards **9**
2.1 Handle decompositions 10
2.2 From Morse theory to a handle decomposition 11
2.3 From smooth to PL handlebodies, and backwards 12

---

[*] Supported by the Swedish Research Council, grant "Triangulerade Mångfalder, Knutteori i diskrete Morseteori".

3 From PL handles to discrete Morse functions on PL subdivisions, and backwards 13
3.1 From discrete Morse functions to PL handle decompositions 13
3.2 From PL handle decompositions to discrete Morse functions 16
3.3 Non-PL structures and discrete Morse theory 19
3.4 Duality, 4-manifolds, and LC triangulations 21
3.5 The case of 3-manifolds: A characterization of the Heegaard genus 23

Introduction

The term “d-dimensional manifold” was introduced by Riemann in 1854 [Rat06, Rie53]. Ever since, the definition has been adapted to multiple contexts. *Topological manifolds* are “compact Hausdorff spaces locally homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^d$” [1]. Interestingly, many topological manifolds carry extra structures. For example, *Riemannian manifolds*, the objects originally considered by Riemann, come with an interior product, which allows us to compute shortest paths and angles. *Smooth manifolds* are locally diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^d$, which allows us to do differential calculus on them. *Triangulable manifolds* are homeomorphic to some simplicial complex; this combinatorial structure allows us to tackle them algorithmically, and to store them into a computer.

All these structures are not equivalent in general. More precisely, smooth and Riemannian manifolds are the same; yet they are only some of the triangulable manifolds, which in turn are only some of the topological manifolds.

In the Thirties, Morse had the idea to analyze a smooth manifold by considering a generic smooth functional defined on it. Focusing only on the critical points (maxima, minima, saddles) of the functional, which are finitely many, he was able to understand the homotopy type of the whole manifold:

> Morse [Mor25]: *Assume some smooth d-manifold M admits a generic smooth function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ that has c_i critical points of index i ($i = 0, \dots, d$). Then M is homotopy equivalent to a cell complex with c_i i-cells.*

From now on, the assumption above will be shortened as “M has *Morse vector* $(c_0, \dots, c_d)$”. Using cellular homology, the result above implies that the Morse vector is always coordinate-wise greater or equal than the *Betti vector* $\beta = (\,\beta_1(M), \dots, \beta_d(M)\,)$.

In 2000, Forman published a combinatorial version of Morse theory, which applies to arbitrary simplicial complexes — hence in particular to triangulations of manifolds. A discrete Morse function is a map $f : C \to \mathbb{Z}$ that satisfies three properties:

(i) (Monotonicity) If $\sigma \subset \tau$, then $f(\sigma) \le f(\tau)$.
(ii) (Semi-injectivity) For each $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, the cardinality of $f^{-1}(z)$ is at most 2.
(iii) (Genericity) If $f(\sigma) = f(\tau)$, then either $\sigma \subset \tau$ or $\tau \subset \sigma$.

If one defines *critical faces* as the faces at which f is injective, Forman discovered that critical faces determine the triangulation up to homotopy, exactly like in Morse theory:

---

[1] Other authors adopt weaker definitions, e.g. by removing the Hausdorff requirement, or by dropping the compactness assumption in favour of local compactness. According to our definition, Alexander’s horned sphere is not a manifold, $\mathbb{R}^d$ is not a manifold, and a sphere minus its equator is not a manifold. Also, all the manifolds we consider here are orientable.

> Forman [For02]: *Assume some simplicial d-complex C admits a discrete Morse function $f : C \to \mathbb{Z}$ that has c_i critical faces of dimension i ($i = 0, \ldots, d$). Then C is homotopy equivalent to a cell complex with c_i i-cells.*

Let us shorten the assumption above as "C has *discrete Morse vector* $(c_0, \ldots, c_d)$"; as before, the discrete Morse vector bounds coordinate-wise the Betti vector from above.

Here we focus on the relation between Morse vectors and discrete Morse vectors on a fixed topological manifold. To do this, we examine the connection between Morse theory and handlebodies.

Roughly speaking, Morse theory yields a way to decompose a manifold into blocks called "handles"; each handle contains one critical point, and is homeomorphic to a d-ball. The index of the critical point refers to how this ball is attached to the others, as explained for example in Rourke–Sanderson's book [RS72].

In 2009, Jerše and Mramor-Kosta discovered that discrete Morse theory yields a similar way to decompose (part of) a triangulation C into "descending regions", each containing one critical point [JM09]. This generated some optimism to obtain from this a handle decomposition of C. However, there are two main difficulties to bypass:

(i) The descending regions are not necessarily full-dimensional. (This can be easily fixed by passing to a regular neighborhood.)

(ii) The union of the (neighborhoods) of the descending regions is not the whole complex C (unless C is a manifold with empty boundary [JM09, Prop. 2]), but just a deformation retract of it. This retract need not be homeomorphic to C, cf. Remark 3.6.

The counterexample of Remark 3.6, however, is not PL. PL is short for Piecewise Linear, and refers to the technical assumption that each vertex star must have a subdivision isomorphic to some subdivision of the simplex.

Our new result is that if C is PL, the union of the regular neighborhoods of the descending regions *is* homeomorphic to C. This was first conjectured by Ulrich Bauer and by Neža Mramor-Kosta, in private communications to the author, for which we wish to thank them. The key technical tool to prove it is the shelling technique of Theorem 3.8, which was very recently proven by Adiprasito–Benedetti [AB12, Theorem 5.3]. Using the same tool, we are also able to simplify the argument in [Ben10b] to derive a discrete Morse function from a PL handle decomposition. This way we are able to show that *every PL handle vector is also a discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation, and the other way around.* Combining this with the known relations between smooth Morse vectors and PL handle vectors, we obtain the following new result:

Main Theorem A (Theorems 2.14, 3.2 and 3.17)**.** *For arbitrary topological manifolds,*

- *every smooth Morse vector is also a discrete Morse vector on some (compatible) PL triangulation. In dimension ≤ 7, the converse holds too.*
- *More generally, every smooth Morse vector is a discrete Morse vector on* any *PL triangulation (compatible with the given smooth structure), up to subdividing this triangulation barycentrically a finite number of times first.*

So, if we restrict ourselves to PL triangulations and to dimensions ≤ 7, smooth and discrete Morse theory are *equivalent* when it comes to bounding Betti numbers.

All triangulations of 3-manifolds are PL. Hence, Main Theorem A reads that a closed 3-manifold M admits a Heegaard splitting of genus g if and only if some triangulations of M has discrete Morse vector $(1, g, g, 1)$. This allows us to re-write in the language of discrete Morse theory a recent result by Li, who constructed hyperbolic 3-manifolds of Heegaard genus larger than their "rank", i.e. the minimal number of generators for the fundamental group [Li11b]:

Corollary B (Corollary 3.33). *For every $g > 0$, there is a 3-manifold M such that any discrete Morse function on any triangulation of M has more than $g + \mathrm{rank}(M)$ critical edges.*

Corollary 3.33 yields a topological obstruction to the existence of nice discrete Morse functions. Unlike the knot-theoretic obstruction discussed in [Ben12a], this obstruction cannot be removed by performing a convenient subdivision.

Here is a further instance of "obstructions that cannot be fixed by subdividing":

Proposition C (Proposition 3.28). *No triangulation of the Mazur manifold is locally constructible.*

This sheds further light on the question by Živaljevič (cf. [Ben10b]) of whether all simply connected smooth 4-manifolds admit a locally constructible triangulation. For manifolds with boundary of dimension different than 4, Živaljevič's conjecture is true: This was proven in [Ben10b], and it follows from a result of Wall [Wal71] and Main Theorem A.

Finally, we turn to an issue left open by Forman's Sphere Theorem, which claims that every closed manifold with discrete Morse vector $(1, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)$, is a d-sphere. Forman's proof distinguishes two cases: the PL case, where the conclusion follows from a result by Whitehead, and the non-PL case, in which one has to use the Poincaré conjecture. However, due to the lack of examples, it was unclear whether the non-PL case is void or not. It is not:

Proposition D (Proposition 3.20). *For each $d \geq 5$, some non-PL triangulation of the d-sphere admits a discrete Morse function with only two critical faces.*

In particular, there exists a non-PL ball B that is endo-collapsible, which means that after the removal of any interior facet, it collapses onto ∂B. This shows that our Ball Theorem from [Ben12a] ("all endocollapsible manifolds are balls") is strictly stronger than Whitehead's theorem ("all collapsible PL manifolds are balls").

Notation

A *topological d-manifold* (with boundary) is a compact Hausdorff space, locally homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^d$ (or to a halfspace in $\mathbb{R}^d$). All the manifolds we consider here are connected and orientable. A *chart* on a topological d-manifold M is a pair (U, ϕ), where U is a subset of M, and ϕ is some homeomorphism that maps U into an open subset $\phi(U)$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. A *smooth d-manifold* is a topological d-manifold that admits a collection of charts (U_i, ϕ_i) such that the U_i cover M, and the induced transition maps between any two charts are smooth (that is, C^∞).

A *(simplicial) complex* is a non-empty, finite family of simplices in some $\mathbb{R}^k$ such that any two of them intersect at a common face. The *dimension* of a complex is the maximum of the simplex dimensions; *d-complex* is short for "d-dimensional simplicial complex". The *face poset* of a complex is the set of all of its simplices, ordered by inclusion. Two complexes are called *combinatorially equivalent* if their face posets are isomorphic as posets. The *underlying space* $|C|$ of a simplicial complex C is the topological space given by the union of the simplices of C. If X is any topological space homeomorphic to $|C|$, the complex C is called a *triangulation* of X. A *subdivision* of a simplicial complex C is a complex C' with $|C| = |C'|$, such that for every face F' of C' there is a face F of C with $|F'| \subset |F|$. Two complexes are called *PL-homeomorphic* if some subdivision of one is combinatorially equivalent to some subdivision of the other. Two triangulations that are PL homeomorphic can always be connected by a finite sequence of bistellar flips: See Pachner [Pac87]. A *PL ball* (resp. a *PL sphere*) is a complex PL-homeomorphic to a simplex (resp. to the boundary of a simplex). A triangulation of a manifold M is called *PL* if the star of every vertex is a PL ball.

1 Triangulations

In this section, we recall some of the classical results about the possibility to triangulate a given manifold. We recommend the survey by Milnor [Mil09] or the book by Buoncristiano [Buo03] for further reading. In Section 2 we review the notion of handle decomposition. The reader already familiar with these tools may skip directly to Section 3.

1.1 The Poincaré conjecture

We start by recalling perhaps the most outstanding result in topology, usually referred to as *the Poincaré conjecture*. Recall that a *homology sphere* is a topological d-manifold with the same homology of the d-sphere. Not all homology spheres are spheres: Poincaré constructed homology 3-spheres that are not simply connected, cf. [BL00]. However he conjectured that all simply connected homology spheres must be spheres. After a century of progress, the conjecture proved right.

Theorem 1.1 (Perelman [Per02], Freedman [Fre82], Smale [Sma62]). *Every simply connected homology d-sphere is homeomorphic to the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.*

Corollary 1.2. *Every contractible d-manifold with simply connected boundary is homeomorphic to the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

It is natural to ask whether "homeomorphic" can be replaced in the results above by "diffeomorphic". The answer is positive in dimension $d \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 61\}$, unknown for $d = 4$ and for large d, and known to be negative otherwise, at least for $d \leq 64$ [Mil63, KM63]. See also Example 1.7 below. However, in Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 the conclusion "homeomorphic" can indeed be strengthened to "PL-homeomorphic", except possibly in dimension four:

Theorem 1.3 (Perelman [Per02], Smale [Sma62], Stallings [Sta62], Zeeman [Zee61]). *Every simply connected PL homology d-sphere, if $d \neq 4$, is PL-homeomorphic to the boundary of the $(d + 1)$-simplex.*

Corollary 1.4. *Every PL contractible manifold of dimension $d \neq 4$ and with simply connected boundary is a* PL ball.

In dimension $d = 4$, the situation is quite unclear: See Section 1.5.

1.2 All smooth manifolds can be PL triangulated

To show that all smooth manifolds can be triangulated there are several ways; the argument we present here is due to Cairns [Cai61]. Without loss of generality, we may focus on smooth submanifolds of Euclidean space: In fact, by Whitney's embedding theorem, every smooth d-manifold is diffeomorphic to some submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Recall that an *open covering* of M is a family of open sets whose union contains M. If $B(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)$ denotes the open ball of radius ε and center $\mathbf{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, then obviously

$$\bigcup_{x \in M} B(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) \supset M.$$

Since M is compact, finitely many of these balls actually suffice to cover M. Any finite set of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_s$ such that the balls $B(\mathbf{x}_i, \varepsilon)$ form a covering of M is called an *ε-net of M*.

Theorem 1.5 (Cairns [Cai61])**.** *Every smooth manifold can be PL triangulated.*

Sketch of proof. Let $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_s\}$ be an ε-net of M. Consider now the Voronoi diagram $\mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ associated to these s points. For each i, let us denotes the cell containing $\mathbf{x}_i$ by Z_i. Consider the sets $C_i := Z_i \cap M$. Since the Z_i partition $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{s} C_i = M.$$

Cairns showed that if ε is small enough the C_i's are cells, and the intersections $C_i \cap C_j$ are also cells. Hence, the C_i form a regular cell complex. In general, a regular cell complex need not be a simplicial complex, but its barycentric subdivision is. □

The triangulation constructed in Theorem 1.5 is called a *Whitehead triangulation* of M. Up to PL-equivalence, it is the unique PL structure that satisfies a certain compatibility condition with respect to M, the so called *Whitehead compatibility condition* [Whi61, KS77]. In particular, any two PL triangulations obtained via Theorem 1.5 (with different choices of ε-nets) are PL-homeomorphic. In other words, up to PL equivalence it makes sense to speak of *the* Whitehead triangulation of M.

1.3 Not all PL triangulations come from smooth structures

A smooth structure on a topological manifold X is an equivalence class of smooth manifolds M homeomorphic to X that are related by orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms. We saw that from a smooth structure one can always pass to a PL structure. How about the converse? Can we pass from a PL structure to a smooth structure? The answer, in general, is negative.

Intuitively, the problem is this: Two triangulated d-manifolds A and B (with non-empty boundary) can always be glued together. For this we just have to specify two combinatorially equivalent $(d-1)$-submanifolds $S_A \subset \partial A$ and $S_B \subset \partial B$, and then identify $S_A \equiv S_B$. If A and B are PL triangulations, their union will also be PL. In contrast, if we take two smooth d-manifolds A and B, and we identify diffeomorphic $(d-1)$-submanifolds S_A and S_B of their boundaries, we might not obtain a smooth structure on the union. In fact, we should explain how to smoothly extend the attaching diffeomorphism (of S_A and S_B) into (part of) the interiors of A and of B. This is not always possible, as demonstrated by the following, non-trivial counterexample.

Example 1.6 (PL manifolds with no smooth structure)**.** Kervaire's 10-dimensional topological manifold admits a PL triangulation. However, Kervaire proved that this triangulation is not homeomorphic to, and not even homotopy equivalent to, any smooth manifold [Ker60]. Munkres and Hirsch developed an obstruction theory to the existence of a smooth structures compatible with a given PL manifold [Mun60, HM74].

But supposing a smooth structure exists, can one recover it from a given PL structure? The answer in this case is also negative: Even if a compatible smooth structure exists, it need not be unique.

Example 1.7 (PL spheres with many compatible smooth structures)**.** Milnor constructed a smooth 7-manifold homeomorphic to, but not diffeomorphic to, the unit sphere S^7 in $\mathbb{R}^8$ [Mil56]. The usual terminology is to speak of *exotic smooth structures* on the 7-sphere. A single exotic structure produces many other exotic structures, just by taking connected sums. (It is a deep result in topology that smooth structures on S^d form a finite abelian group with respect to the connected sum [KM63], except possibly for $d = 4$.) By Theorem 1.3, all spheres of dimension different than 4 admit a unique PL structure. In other words, if we apply the construction of Theorem 1.5 to all of Milnor's exotic 7-spheres, we get PL triangulations that are PL-homeomorphic (and can be connected to one another via a finite sequence of bistellar flips.)

However, all these problems occur in higher dimensions. If the dimension of the manifold is sufficiently small, any PL triangulation induces a unique smooth structure.

Theorem 1.8 (Kervaire–Milnor[KM63], Hirsch–Mazur [HM74], Munkres [Mun60])**.** *If $d \leq 7$, every PL d-manifold has at least one compatible smooth structure; and if $d \leq 6$, the compatible structure is unique up to diffeomorphism.*

We stress that the result above does *not* say that 6-manifolds have a unique smooth structure. It says that the number of (non-diffeomorphic) smooth structures, for $d \leq 6$, is the same as the number of (non-PL-homeomorphic) PL triangulations. In dimension $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, this number is one, by the work of Papakyriakopoulos and Moise [Moi52]. However, if $d \in \{4, 5, 6\}$, several PL structures may appear. For example, Hsiang–Shaneson proved that the 5-torus admits many smooth structures [HS70].

1.4 Lack of (PL) triangulations

In Section 1.2, we showed that every smooth manifold admits a PL triangulation. This raises two natural questions: (1) Does every topological manifold admit a triangulation?

(2) Is every triangulation PL? The answer to both questions is negative, as we will see. Let us start with a positive result:

Theorem 1.9 (Moise ($d \leq 3$), Perelman ($d = 4$))**.** *All triangulations of d-manifolds, for* $d \leq 4$*, are PL.*

In particular, a 4-dimensional topological manifold admits a triangulation if and only if it admits a PL structure; by Theorem 1.8, this is equivalent to the existence of a smooth structure.

Example 1.10 (Freedman [Fre82])**.** Using a theorem by Rokhlin [Rok52], Freedman constructed a 4-dimensional topological manifold, the so called E_8*-manifold*, that does not admit any smooth structure. It follows from Theorem 1.9 (or alternatively, from Casson's work, cf. [Mil09]) that E_8 does not admit a triangulation either.

In higher dimensions, the situation is unclear. A big open problem is whether all topological manifolds of dimension > 4 admit a triangulation. Interestingly, this problem can be reduced to a question on 3-dimensional homology spheres: See Galewski–Stern [GS80] and Ranicki [Ran96]. All we know is that Theorem 1.9 does not extend to higher dimensions, because some triangulations are not PL. This was discovered in the Seventies by Edwards and Cannon, as we will now explain.

A *homology sphere* is a manifold with the same homology as a sphere. Homology spheres need not be simply-connected. A *homology-manifold* is a pure simplicial complex in which, for every face τ of codimension k, the $(k-1)$-complex $\mathrm{Link}\,(\tau, C)$ has the same homology of a $(k-1)$-sphere. All triangulated manifolds are homology manifolds, but not the other way around. For example, the suspension of a homology sphere that is not a sphere, is a homology-manifold that is not a manifold.

Theorem 1.11 (Cannon [Can79], Edwards [Edw78, Edw06])**.** *Let* C *be any homology-manifold. The following are equivalent:*

(i) C *is a manifold;*

(ii) *for every vertex* v *of* C*,* $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C)$ *is simply connected.*

A famous instance of this criterion is the so called Double Suspension theorem. Recall that the *suspension* of a simplicial complex C is the complex

$$\Sigma(C) \;=\; \{x,\, y\} * C,$$

where x and y are two new vertices. In other words, $\Sigma(C)$ is the join of C and a 0-sphere.

Corollary 1.12 (Double Suspension theorem)**.** *Let* H *be any d-dimensional homology sphere. The double suspension* $\Sigma^2(H) = \Sigma(\Sigma(H))$ *is a manifold, homeomorphic to* S^{d+2}*. Since four edge links in* $\Sigma^2(H)$ *are combinatorially equivalent to* H*, if* H *is not a (PL) sphere the manifold* $\Sigma^2(H)$ *is not PL.*

In a non-PL closed manifold, the subcomplex of faces whose link is not a PL sphere is called *PL singular set.* Inside $\Sigma^2(H) = S^0 * S^0 * H$, the singular set is $S^0 * S^0$, a 4-cycle formed by the apices of the suspensions: In fact, the link of each edge in this cycle is H.

The manifolds $\Sigma^2(H)$ constructed in Corollary 1.12 are all topologically spheres, by the Poincaré conjecture. In particular, they all admit also PL triangulations, like the boundary of the $(d+1)$-simplex. One could wonder if there exist manifolds that admit only non-PL triangulations. This is indeed the case, as discovered by Kirby and Siebenmann:

Example 1.13 (Kirby–Siebenmann [KS77])**.** For every $d \geq 5$, there exists a d-manifold that admits a triangulation, but does not admit any PL triangulation. In fact, any d-manifold M, $d \geq 4$ can be PL triangulated if and only if the Kirby-Siebenmann invariant $\kappa(M) \in H^4(M, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ vanishes. This in particular implies that all manifolds with $H^4(M, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) = 0$ can be PL triangulated. Thus, all contractible manifolds can be triangulated! In fact, Gleason even discovered that all contractible manifolds admit a smooth structure, cf. [HM74].

Clearly, by Theorem 1.5 the manifolds of Example 1.13 do not admit any smooth structure.

1.5 The case of 4-manifolds

The 4-dimensional case, as far as manifolds are concerned, is the most bizarre and complicated. On one hand, by the work of Perelman, all triangulations of all 4-manifolds are PL (Theorem 1.9). Furthermore, every PL structure corresponds to a unique smooth structure (Theorem 1.8). However, exotic structures on 4-manifolds are far from being understood. One of the big remaining open problems in topology, is the question of whether exotic 4-spheres exist.

Problem 1 (Smooth Poincaré conjecture)**.** *Is there a manifold homeomorphic to S^4, but not diffeomorphic to it?*

Since smooth structures are in bijection with PL structures, one could rephrase the question above in the PL category as "are there other PL structures on S^4 than the boundary of the 5-simplex?". By definition, PL spheres are precisely spheres that are PL-homeomorphic to the simplex boundary. In [AB12] we characterized PL spheres as those that becomes shellable after sufficiently many barycentric subdivisions. Hence, a third way to rephrase Problem 1 is: "Are there triangulations of S^4 that remain unshellable after any finite number of barycentric subdivisions?"

At the moment we have no invariant to distinguish smooth structures on S^4. (Very recently Rasmussen's splice invariant has sparkled some optimism in this direction, cf. [FGMW10].) Some evidence in favor of the smooth Poincaré conjecture, is that all reasonable candidates for counterexamples have been proven standard: See Akbulut [Akb10] and Gompf [Gom10]. Some evidence against the conjecture, instead, is represented by the discovery that some 4-manifolds have many exotic smooth structures. For example, Akhmedov and Park have recently claimed that $S^2 \times S^2$ admits infinitely many smooth structures. So, a priori there could be infinitely many exotic 4-spheres; or some; or none. The only thing we know is that they can be at most countably many.

2 From smooth manifolds to PL handle decompositions, and backwards

The purpose of this section is to explain why all smooth manifolds can be decomposed into PL handles. We then recall how, in low dimensions, it is possible to go back from a PL handle decomposition to a compatible smooth structure. The results of this Section are all classical, but we re-state them for the sake of completeness. The reader who is familiar with these tools can jump directly to Section 3.

2.1 Handle decompositions

Handle decompositions can be viewed as a divide and conquer method: To understand an arbitrary d-manifold, we chop it into d-balls, which are glued together at $(d-1)$-submanifolds of their boundaries. These submanifolds have a somewhat prescribed topology: They are required to be products of balls and spheres.

Definition 2.1 (Attaching a i-handle)**.** Let M' and $H^{(i)}$ be two d-dimensional topological manifolds (resp. PL manifolds, resp. smooth manifolds) with non-empty boundary. Suppose that:

- $H^{(i)}$ is homeomorpic (resp. PL homeomorphic, resp. diffeomorphic) to a d-ball.
- Some $(d-1)$-submanifold A' of $\partial M'$ and some $(d-1)$-submanifold A of $\partial H^{(i)}$ are both homeomorphic to $S^{i-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-i}$ (resp. combinatorially equivalent and homeomorphic to $S^{i-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-i}$, resp. diffeomorphic to $S^{i-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-i}$ via a diffeomorphism that can be extended to the interior of M' and $H^{(i)}$).

Let M be the d-manifold obtained by gluing M' to $H^{(i)}$ via the identification $A' \equiv A$. We say that M is the result of *attaching a i-handle to M' in the topological* (resp. *PL*, resp. *smooth*) *category.* Adopting a classical abuse of notation, we will also write $M = M' \cup H^{(i)}$ and say that M is the union of M and $H^{(i)}$.

Definition 2.2 (Handle decomposition)**.** Let M be a topological d-manifold (resp. a PL d-manifold, resp. a smooth d-manifold) with possibly empty boundary. A *topological* (resp. *PL*, resp. *smooth*) *handle decomposition for M* is an expression of the form

$$M \;=\; H_0^{(0)} \cup H_1^{(i_1)} \;\ldots\; H_k^{(i_k)},$$

where each $H_h^{(i_h)}$ is a i_h-handle attached onto the union of the previous ones, in the topological (resp. PL, resp. smooth) category.

Example 2.3. The unit ball in any euclidean space admits a smooth handle decomposition into one 0-handle. Conversely, any manifold with a smooth handle decomposition consisting of one handle only, is, by definition, diffeomorphic to the unit ball in some euclidean space.

Example 2.4. The standard d-sphere S^d admits a smooth handle decomposition into one 0-handle and one d-handle. It follows from the work by Cerf [Cer70] on twisted diffeomorphisms that also all exotic d-spheres, for $d \geq 7$, admit a smooth handle decomposition into one 0-handle and one d-handle.

Example 2.5. If any exotic 4-sphere exists, then it cannot have a smooth handle decomposition into one 0-handle and one 4-handle. This is because all orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $S^3 \to S^3$ are isotopic, by the work of Moise [Moi52]. (The smoothing of the attaching diffeomorphism is unique, by Theorem 1.8.) It follows that if a closed 4-manifold M has a smooth handle decomposition into two handles, attached via some diffeomorphism $S^3 \to S^3$, then M is diffeomorphic to the standard 4-sphere. This could be considered a reason why exotic 4-spheres are difficult to find (if they exist): To construct them, one needs to deal with complicated smooth handle decompositions.

Every manifold of dimension different than 4 admits a *topological* handle decomposition. In contrast, the 4-manifolds admitting topological handle decompositions are precisely those that admit a smooth structure.

Example 2.6. The E_8 4-manifold by Freedman does not admit any topological handle decomposition.

In the next sections, we will see that

- the manifolds that admit a *smooth* handle decomposition, are precisely those that admit a smooth structure (Theorem 2.9 & Proposition 2.10);
- the manifolds that admit a *PL* handle decomposition, are precisely all manifolds admitting a PL triangulation (Corollary 3.11).

2.2 From Morse theory to a handle decomposition

Let M denote a closed smooth manifold. Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. As we know from calculus, the *critical points* of f are the points at which the gradient of f vanishes. If f is generic, it will have a finite number of isolated critical points; and the critical points will have different images under f. Since M is closed and compact, and f is continuous, by Weierstrass' theorem f must have a maximum and a minimum; so, if $\dim M > 0$, f will have at least two critical points. From now on, a generic smooth function will be called a *Morse function*, or sometimes a *smooth Morse function*, to highlight the difference with discrete Morse theory.

Definition 2.7 (Index)**.** Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Morse function. The index of a critical point $p \in M$ of f is the dimension of the largest subspace of the tangent space T_pM on which the Hessian of f is negative definite.

Intuitively, the index is the number of independent directions around p in which f decreases. Any local minimum has index 0; any local maximum has index equal to the dimension of M.

Lemma 2.8 (Morse)**.** *Let M denote a closed smooth manifold. Fix a generic smooth function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$, and let $p_1, \dots, p_k$ be its critical points. For any real number a, let us denote by $M_{\leq a}$ the preimage under f of the closed interval $(-\infty, a]$.*

1. *Suppose the interval $[a, b]$ contains none of the critical values. Then $M_{\leq b}$ is diffeomorphic to $M_{\leq a}$.*
2. *Suppose the interval $[a, b]$ contains exactly one of the critical values, say, $f(p_1)$. Let i be the index of the critical point p_1. Then $M_{\leq b}$ is diffeomorphic to the manifold obtained by attaching an i-handle to $M_{\leq a}$ in the smooth category.*

Proof. See Milnor [Mil63] or Matsumoto [Mat02]. □

Theorem 2.9. *Let M denote a closed smooth manifold. Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary (smooth) Morse function. Then, M admits a smooth handle decomposition into c_i i-handles, where c_i counts the number of index-i critical points of f.*

Proof. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ be the critical points of f. Up to relabeling them, we can assume $f(p_1) < f(p_2) < \ldots < f(p_k)$. Choose $k+1$ real numbers $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ such that

$$\lambda_0 \ < \ f(p_1) \ < \ \lambda_1 \ < \ f(p_2) \ < \ \lambda_2 \ < \ldots \ < \ \lambda_{k-1} \ < \ f(p_k) \ < \ \lambda_k.$$

Since the minimum and the maximum of f on M are points at which the gradient of f vanishes, the minimum of f on M must be p_1, and the maximum of f on M must be p_k. In particular, $\lambda_0 < \{f(x) : x \in M\} < \lambda_k$. Hence $M_{\leq \lambda_0}$ is empty, while $M_{\leq \lambda_k} = M$. The conclusion then follows by applying Lemma 2.8 to all intervals $[\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}]$, in this order. ☐

The converse also holds: Every smooth handlebody decomposition comes from a Morse function, as the following folklore result shows.

Proposition 2.10. *Let M denote a closed smooth manifold. If M has a smooth handle decomposition into c_i i-handles, some Morse function f on M has c_i critical points of index i.*

To see this, flatten the corners, as in Kirby–Siebenmann [KS77, III, 4.3] or Cerf [Cer68]. The handle attachment then gives rise to a gradient field on the manifold whose antiderivative is the desired Morse function.

In view of Theorem 2.9 and Proposition 2.10, we can extend the definition of smooth Morse vector to manifolds with boundary:

Definition 2.11. A manifold with boundary has *Morse vector* $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ if it admits a smooth handle decomposition into c_i i-handles.

By Theorem 2.9 and Proposition 2.10, if M has empty boundary this definition coincides with the one in terms of the number of critical i-cells of a Morse function.

2.3 From smooth to PL handlebodies, and backwards

Let us quickly review the relation between Morse theory and PL handlebody theory.

Remark 2.12 (Smooth handle decompositions are also PL handle decompositions)**.** Suppose a smooth manifold M (with or without boundary) has a smooth handle decomposition into smooth handles H_i^{s}. By Theorem 1.5, both the handles and the diffeomorphisms attaching them to each other can be PL triangulated, obtaining a family of PL handles H_i^{PL}, attached along PL homeomorphisms of their boundary. The manifold resulting from gluing the H_i^{PL} is M, and the resulting triangulation is PL homeomorphic to the standard triangulation of M obtained by Theorem 1.5.

The converse of Remark 2.12 is more delicate: As we have seen in Section 1.3, associated to a given PL manifold there might be no smooth structure, or more than one. However, in low dimensions, the obstruction theories of Munkres [Mun60] and Hirsch [HM74] yield the following:

Proposition 2.13 (Hirsch [HM74], Munkres [Mun60])**.** *Let M be a PL manifold of dimension $d \leq 7$, with or without boundary, that admits a PL handle decomposition into c_i i-handles. Then M admits a smooth handle decomposition with c_i i-handles.*

Combining this with Remark 2.12, Theorem 2.9 and Proposition 2.10, we obtain:

Theorem 2.14. *Let M denote a manifold of dimension $d \leq 7$ (with or without boundary). The following are equivalent:*

(i) *M admits a smooth Morse function with c_k critical points of index k.*
(ii) *M admits a smooth handle decomposition with c_k k-handles.*
(iii) *M admits a PL handle decomposition with c_k k-handles.*

For $d > 7$, one has (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii)*, but the converse of the last implication is false.*

3 From PL handles to discrete Morse functions on PL subdivisions, and backwards

Recall: a smooth d-manifold has *Morse vector* $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ if it admits a smooth handle decomposition with exactly c_i i-handles. (If the manifold is closed, this is equivalent to admitting a Morse function with exactly c_i critical points of index i.) Analogously, a d-dimensional simplicial complex has *discrete Morse vector* $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ if it admits a discrete Morse function with exactly c_i critical i-cells. Finally, we say that a PL manifold has *PL handle vector* $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ if it admits a PL handle decomposition with exactly c_i i-handles. In the previous section, we have shown that

$$\{\text{Morse vectors of M}\} \subset \{\text{PL handle vectors of M}\},$$

with equality if the dimension of M is at most seven. In this section, we prove the following new result:

Theorem 3.1. *For any PL d-manifold M, with or without boundary,*

$$\big\{\text{PL handle vectors of M}\big\} = \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{discrete Morse vectors}\\ \text{on PL triangulations of M}\end{matrix}\right\} \subset \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{discrete Morse vectors}\\ \text{on triangulations of M}\end{matrix}\right\},$$

and the inclusion on the right is not an equality in general.

Proof. In Section 3.1 we will show that every discrete Morse vector on a PL triangulation of M is also a PL handle vector. In Section 3.2 we will prove the converse, namely, that every PL handle vector is also a discrete Morse vector on *some* PL triangulation. (In fact, we show something stronger, namely, that *any* PL triangulation can be used, up to subdividing it barycentrically a suitable number of times.) Finally, Example 3.19 is a 5-manifold on which $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a discrete Morse vector (on some non-PL triangulation), but not a PL handle vector. ☐

3.1 From discrete Morse functions to PL handle decompositions

Recall that a discrete Morse function is any map $f : C \to \mathbb{Z}$ that satisfies:

(i) (Monotonicity) If $\sigma \subset \tau$, then $f(\sigma) \leq f(\tau)$.
(ii) (Semi-injectivity) For each $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, the cardinality of $f^{-1}(z)$ is at most 2.
(iii) (Genericity) If $f(\sigma) = f(\tau)$, then either $\sigma \subset \tau$ or $\tau \subset \sigma$.

The *critical faces* of C under f are the faces at which f is injective. Our first goal is to prove the following result:

Theorem 3.2. *If a topological manifold M has a PL triangulation T on which some discrete Morse function has c_i critical i-faces, then for some r the complex $\mathrm{sd}^r T$ has a PL handle decomposition with c_i i-handles.*

The proof of Theorem 3.2 relies on three results in PL topology. Two of them are very old and due to Whitehead (Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 3.7); the other is very recent and due to Adiprasito and the author (Theorem 3.8).

Aside from these tools, the proof is inspired by the 2009 paper by Jerše and Mramor-Kosta [JM09], which shows how to divide a triangulation (PL or not) into "descending regions". These regions may be lower-dimensional, but there is a standard trick to fix this, namely, one can thicken them by passing to a regular neighborhood. Formally, let us denote by $\mathrm{sd}^m C$ the m-th iterated barycentric subdivision of a complex C, recursively defined as $\mathrm{sd}^m C = \mathrm{sd}(\mathrm{sd}^{m-1} C)$. If D is a subcomplex of a manifold M, the *m-th derived neighborhood of D in M*, usually denoted by $N^m(C, M)$, is the subcomplex of $\mathrm{sd}^m(M)$ formed by the cells whose closure intersects $\mathrm{sd}^m(D) \subset \mathrm{sd}^m(M)$.

The regular neighborhood of any subcomplex collapses onto it:

Lemma 3.3 (Whitehead, cf. Glaser [Gla70, Lemma III.9 and III.10])**.** *Let C be a subcomplex of a (PL or non-PL) triangulated manifold M. For each $m \geq 2$, the m-th derived neighborhood of C collapses onto C.*

In particular, if we have a discrete Morse function defined on a subcomplex of some PL manifold, we can lift it to a discrete Morse function defined on a regular neighborhood of the subcomplex:

Lemma 3.4. *Let C be a subcomplex of a PL triangulated manifold M. Suppose C admits a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces. For any $n \geq 0$ and $m \geq 2$ integers, also the complex $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(C, M)$ admits a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces.*

Proof. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since C admits a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces, so does the barycentric subdivision of C; and by induction, so do all iterated barycentric subdivisions of C. In particular, $\mathrm{sd}^{n+m} C$ has a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces. If in addition $m \geq 2$, by Lemma 3.3 the regular neighborhood $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(C, M)$ collapses onto $\mathrm{sd}^{n+m} C$, whence we conclude. ☐

Collapses are not internal operations with respect to the class of triangulated manifolds. However, using regular neighborhoods, as explained for example in Rourke–Sanderson [RS72], it is possible to introduce a structure that allows us to speak in the language of manifolds.

Definition 3.5 (cf. Rourke–Sanderson [RS72, p. 40])**.** Let M be a triangulated d-manifold. Let Δ be a d-face of M. Let M' be a submanifold of M that contains all d-faces of M, except Δ. If M collapses onto M', the reduction of M into M' is called *elementary shelling.* We say that M *shells to* M' if some sequence of elementary shelling reduces M to M'.

Remark 3.6. Each elementary shelling maintains the homeomorphism class. So, if M shells to M', then M and M' are homeomorphic. In contrast, if a manifold M collapses onto a manifold M', then M and M' need not be homeomorphic: This can be seen by barycentrically subdividing the 5-manifold in Example 3.19, so that it collapses onto a 5-ball.

Theorem 3.7 (Whitehead, cf. Rourke–Sanderson [RS72, Theorem 3.26 & Cor. 3.27]). *Let C be a subcomplex of a PL triangulated manifold M. Suppose C collapses to some subcomplex D. Then a regular neighborhood of C shells to a regular neighborhood of D. In case D is a single vertex, this regular neighborhood of C is a PL ball.*

Theorem 3.8 (Adiprasito–Benedetti [AB12, Theorem 5.3]). *Let C, D be polytopal complexes. Suppose that some subdivision C' of C shells to some subdivision D' of D. Then, for n large enough, $\mathrm{sd}^n C$ shells to $\mathrm{sd}^n D$.*

By merging the latter two theorems, we obtain the following consequence:

Corollary 3.9. *Let C be a subcomplex of a PL-manifold M. Suppose C collapses to some subcomplex D. Then for n and m large enough, $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(C, M)$ shells to $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(D, M)$.*

Next, we recall a well-known fact in PL topology. Given a simplicial complex C, a subcomplex D of C of is called *full* if any face σ of C whose vertices are all in D belongs to D as well. For example, for any complex C and for any subcomplex D of C, the barycentric subdivision $\mathrm{sd}\, D$ is always full in $\mathrm{sd}\, C$ [Zee66, Sec. 3].

Lemma 3.10. *Let $k < d$ be non-negative integers. Let C be a k-dimensional full subcomplex of a PL d-manifold M. Let D be the subcomplex of C obtained by removing from C (the interior of) some k-cell σ. Then $N^2(C, M)$ is obtained from $N^2(D, M)$ by attaching a k-handle.*

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We proceed by induction on the number $|\mathbf{c}|$ of critical cells of the discrete Morse function f on T.

$|\mathbf{c}| = 1$ If T has only one critical face, then this face is a single vertex. By Whitehead's Theorem 3.7, T is a PL ball.

$|\mathbf{c}| > 1$ Let us assume that we have proved the claim for triangulations T of manifolds which have a discrete Morse function with $|\mathbf{c}| = k$ critical faces or less. Let T be a triangulation of a manifold with $|\mathbf{c}| = k + 1$ critical cells. Let τ be the critical cell with the highest value under f, and let $t = \dim \tau$ be its dimension. Let Θ denote the subcomplex of T of faces with a value lower than $f(\tau)$ under f. By Corollary 3.9 and Lemma 3.10, for large n and m, the complex $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(T, M)$ can be decomposed into the complex $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(\Theta, M)$ with a PL t-handle attached. By Lemma 3.4, $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(\Theta, M)$ admits a discrete Morse function with c_i critical cells of dimension $i \neq t$, and $c_t - 1$ critical cells of dimension t. By induction on the number of critical cells, $\mathrm{sd}^n N^m(\Theta, M)$ admits the desired PL handle decomposition, and so does T.

□

Corollary 3.11. *Every PL manifold admits a PL handle decomposition (possibly after some iterated barycentric subdivisions).*

Proof. Any simplicial complex admits a discrete Morse function, possibly with many critical faces. If the complex is a PL triangulation, we can conclude via Theorem 3.2. ☐

3.2 From PL handle decompositions to discrete Morse functions

Here we show that every PL handle vector is a discrete Morse vector on *some* iterated barycentric subdivision. This improves on the work by Gallais [Gal10] and the author [Ben10b]. The proof relies on the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.12 (Adiprasito–Benedetti [AB12])**.** *Let B be a PL ball. There is an integer r such that $\mathrm{sd}^r B$ is shellable.*

So, given a PL handle decomposition, up to subdividing it barycentrically suitably many times, we can assume that all handles are shellable. It remains to show how to derive from this a global discrete Morse function. For this we need a few lemmas.

Definition 3.13. Let C_1 and C_2 be disjoint complexes. Let g_i ($i = 1, 2$) be a discrete Morse function on C_i. Up to replacing g_2 with g_2 minus a constant, we can assume that the maximum value of g_2 on C_2 is smaller than the minimum value of g_1 on C_1. The *disjoint union* $f = g_1 \sqcup g_2$ is the function $f : C_1 \sqcup C_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(\sigma) \;=\; \begin{cases} g_1(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \text{ is in } C_1, \\ g_2(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \text{ is in } C_2. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.14. *The function $g_1 \sqcup g_2$ is a discrete Morse function. Its critical i-faces are precisely the critical i-faces of g_1, plus the critical i-faces of g_2. In particular, if the C_i's are pseudo-manifolds and both g_i's are boundary-critical, so is $g_1 \sqcup g_2$.*

Proof. Clearly $g_1 \sqcup g_2$ is weakly-increasing. Since we assumed that $g(C_1)$ and $g(C_2)$ are disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$, the function $g_1 \sqcup g_2$ is also at most 2-to-1 and a discrete Morse function. The faces at which it is injective are those at which one of the g_i is injective. ☐

In the following, by $\mathbb{I}$ we denote the unit interval $[0, 1]$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and by S^i we denote the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{i+1}$. If M is a (pseudo)manifold with boundary, we say that a discrete Morse function on M is *boundary-critical* if all faces of ∂M are critical [Ben12a]. An *endo-collapsible* ball is a ball that admits a boundary-critical discrete Morse function with only one interior critical face [Ben12a]. Equivalently, a ball B is endo-collapsible if B minus a facet collapses onto ∂B. All shellable balls are endo-collapsible [Ben12a].

Lemma 3.15. *Let M be a PL d-manifold with boundary. Suppose $M = B_1 \cup B_2$, where*

(i) *B_1 and B_2 are shellable d-balls,*
(ii) *$B_1 \cap B_2$ is a $(d-1)$-dimensional subcomplex of ∂B_1 and of ∂B_2, and*
(iii) *$B_1 \cap B_2$ is homeomorphic to $S^{i-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-i}$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.*

If (each connected component of) $B_1 \cap B_2$ admits a perfect boundary-critical discrete Morse function, so does $B_1 \cup B_2$. More generally, any boundary-critical discrete Morse function h on $B_1 \cap B_2$ lifts to a boundary-critical discrete Morse function u on $B_1 \cup B_2$. The critical interior cells of u are exactly those of h, minus a $(d-1)$-face, plus a d-face.

Proof. Let Δ be any d-face of B_1. Since B_1 is shellable, it is in particular endo-collapsible, so $B_1 - \Delta$ collapses onto ∂B_1. Note that all free faces removed in such collapse are interior; so glueing B_2 onto a portion of ∂B_1 does not destroy the freeness of any face. Therefore,

$$B_1 \cup B_2 - \Delta \text{ collapses onto } \partial B_1 \cup B_2. \tag{1}$$

Choose a $(d-1)$-face σ of $B_1 \cap B_2$. Since $M = B_1 \cup B_2$ is a (pseudo)manifold, σ is contained in exactly two d-faces Σ_1, Σ_2 of M, with $\Sigma_i \in B_i$. So inside $\partial B_1 \cup B_2$ the face σ is contained in only one d-face, namely, Σ_2. Hence

$$\partial B_1 \cup B_2 \text{ collapses onto } \partial B_1 \cup B_2 - \Sigma_2 - \sigma. \tag{2}$$

Now, since B_2 is shellable, $B_2 - \Sigma_2$ collapses onto ∂B_2. Equivalently, $B_2 - \Sigma_2 - \sigma$ collapses onto $\partial B_2 - \sigma$. This implies that

$$\partial B_1 \cup B_2 - \Sigma_2 - \sigma \text{ collapses onto } \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_2 - \sigma. \tag{3}$$

Let $C := \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_2 = (B_1 \cap B_2) \cup \partial(B_1 \cup B_2)$. The equations (1), (2) and (3) directly imply that $M - \Delta = B_1 \cup B_2 - \Delta$ collapses onto $C - \sigma$. We claim that $C - \sigma$ can be reduced further to ∂M via some sequence of elementary collapses and deletions that is basically determined by the function h on $B_1 \cap B_2$. Let us prove this claim. Since h is a boundary-critical discrete Morse function,

$$B_1 \cap B_2 - \sigma \text{ reduces via collapses/deletions onto } \partial(B_1 \cap B_2). \tag{4}$$

Now, C can be viewed as the result of attaching $(B_1 \cap B_2)$ onto $\partial(B_1 \cup B_2)$ along its boundary $\partial(B_1 \cap B_2)$. In particular, the free faces of $(B_1 \cap B_2)$ in the sequence of the reduction (4), are still free faces after we glue onto $(B_1 \cap B_2)$ the complex $\partial(B_1 \cup B_2)$. So, from (4) we obtain

$$B_1 \cap B_2 \cup \partial(B_1 \cup B_2) - \sigma \text{ reduces via collapses/deletions onto } \partial(B_1 \cap B_2) \cup \partial(B_1 \cup B_2). \tag{5}$$

The left hand side in the latter equation is by definition the complex $C - \sigma$. The right hand side is a union of two complexes of which one contains the other; the union is thus equal to the larger of the two, $\partial(B_1 \cup B_2)$.

In conclusion, $M - \Delta$ collapses onto $C - \sigma$, and using the function h we have reduced $C - \sigma$ further to ∂M. This yields a boundary-critical discrete Morse function u on the union $M = B_1 \cup B_2$. The critical interior cells of h and u are by construction the same, with two exceptions: Δ is a critical face of u, but not of h, because it does not belong to the intersection $B_1 \cap B_2$; σ is a critical face of h, but not of u, because $u(\sigma) = u(\Sigma_2)$. □

Lemma 3.16. *Let M be a PL d-manifold with boundary. Suppose $M = M' \cup B$, where*

(i) *M' is a PL d-manifold with non-empty boundary and B is a shellable d-ball,*
(ii) *M' admits a perfect boundary-critical discrete Morse function g,*
(iii) *$M' \cap B$ is a $(d-1)$-dimensional subcomplex of $\partial M'$ and of ∂B, and*
(iv) *$M' \cap B$ is homeomorphic to $S^{i-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-i}$, for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$.*

If (each connected component of) $M' \cap B$ admits a perfect boundary-critical discrete Morse function, so does $M' \cup B$. More generally, any boundary-critical discrete Morse function h on $M' \cap B$ lifts to a boundary-critical discrete Morse function u on $M' \cup B$. The critical interior cells of u are exactly those of h, minus a $(d-1)$-face, plus all the critical interior cells of g.

Proof. If M' is a ball, the proof is identical to the previous one. (Since g is perfect, the set of the critical interior cells of g consists of a single d-cell.) Otherwise, instead of starting with a collapse of $M' - \Delta$ onto $\partial M'$, one uses the boundary-critical discrete Morse function g on M'. For the rest, the proof is analogous; one should be careful not to forget about these critical cells of g later on, when one counts the number of critical cells of u. ☐

Theorem 3.17. *Let d be a positive integer. Let M be any PL triangulation of any d-manifold with boundary. Assume M has a PL handle decomposition into c_i PL i-handles. For r large enough, one can define on $\mathrm{sd}^r M$*

- *a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces, and*
- *a boundary-critical discrete Morse function with c_{d-i} critical interior i-faces.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.20 in [Ben12a], it suffices to prove the second claim. In fact, all vertex stars in M are PL balls; up to subdividing M barycentrically sufficiently many times (cf. Lemma 3.12), we can assume that all vertex stars in M are shellable. This is the sufficient condition to establish a dual discrete Morse function on $\mathrm{sd}M$ by [Ben12a, Theorem 3.20].

To prove the second claim, we proceed by double induction on the total number of handles, and on the dimension of M. If M is 1-dimensional, then M is a path, a cycle or a disjoint union of combinations of the two, and the theorem is obvious. From now on, in view of Lemma 3.14, we will always assume that M is connected.

If M is a d-manifold with a handle decomposition consisting of one single handle, then M is a PL d-ball. By Lemma 3.12, there is an r such that $\mathrm{sd}^r M$ is shellable. In particular, M is collapsible and endocollapsible, and the claim is proven.

Let M be a d-manifold with a handle decomposition into $\sum c_i$ handles. By definition of handle decomposition, $c_0 \geq 1$ (and since M is connected one can assume $c_0 = 1$). The case $\sum c_i = 1$ has been discussed already, so let us consider the case $\sum c_i \geq 2$. Let B be the last handle in a handle decomposition of M. M is obtained by attaching the j-handle B onto some d-manifold M'; moreover, this M' has a handle decomposition into c'_i i-handles, where the vector $\mathbf{c'}$ is obtained by subtracting 1 to the j-th entry of the vector $\mathbf{c}$. By induction (and using Lemma 3.14 to reduce to the connected case), we can assume that the claim holds

(a) for all d-manifolds with a handle decomposition into fewer than $\sum c_i$ handles (like M'), and
(b) for all manifolds of dimension $< d$.

In particular, we can assume the theorem has been proven already for $M' \cap B$, which is a connected $(d-1)$-manifold if $j \geq 2$ and a $(d-1)$-manifold with two connected components if $j = 1$. In fact, $M' \cap B$ is a PL triangulation of $S^{j-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-j}$. As topological space, $S^{j-1} \times \mathbb{I}^{d-j}$ admits a handle decomposition into two $(d-1)$-dimensional handles, namely, one 0-handle and one $(j-1)$-handle. (When $j = 1$, this means two 0-handles.) If $j > 1$, up to subdividing barycentrically k times, we can assume that $M' \cap B$ has a PL handle decomposition with a_i i-handles, where $a_0 = 1$, $a_1 = \ldots = a_{j-2} = 0$, and $a_{j-1} = 1$. If $j = 1$, after subdividing k times we can assume that $M' \cap B$ has a PL handle decomposition with two PL 0-handles, and no further handle.

By the inductive assumption applied to M', there is an integer r' and a boundary-critical discrete Morse function g on $\mathrm{sd}^{r'} M'$ with exactly c'_{d-i} critical interior i-faces. By the inductive assumption on $M' \cap B$, which is $(d-1)$-dimensional, there is an integer s such that $\mathrm{sd}^s M' \cap B$ has a boundary-critical discrete Morse function f with $a_{(d-1)-i}$ critical interior i-faces. In plain words: one critical interior $(d-1)$-face, plus one critical interior $(d-j)$-face, plus no other critical interior face. Finally, by Lemma 3.12, there is an integer t such that $\mathrm{sd}^t B$ is shellable.

We are now in the position of applying Lemma 3.16. Set $r := \max(r', s+k, t)$. Let us subdivide M barycentrically r times. Then $\mathrm{sd}^r M = \mathrm{sd}^r M' \cup \mathrm{sd}^r B$, where $\mathrm{sd}^r B$ is shellable, $\mathrm{sd}^r M'$ admits a perfect boundary-critical discrete Morse function g, and the intersection $\mathrm{sd}^r M' \cap \mathrm{sd}^r B = \mathrm{sd}^r (M' \cap B)$ admits a perfect boundary-critical discrete Morse function h. By Lemma 3.16, we obtain a boundary-critical discrete Morse function u on $\mathrm{sd}^r M$. The critical interior cells of u are exactly those of h, minus a $(d-1)$-face, plus the critical interior cells of g. If we count them explicitly, F has one critical (interior) d-face; $1 - 1 + c'_1 = c'_1$ critical interior $(d-1)$-faces; and in lower dimensions, the same critical interior faces of g, plus one critical interior $(d-j)$-face. It follows that u has exactly c_i critical interior $(d-i)$-faces. ☐

Caveat: Many barycentric subdivisions might be required

The previous method suggests that, for every PL triangulation T, there exists an integer $r = r(T)$ such that $\mathrm{sd}^r T$ is "perfect" from a discrete Morse-theoretic viewpoint. This is true for spheres, but not for arbitrary manifolds, as we will see in Corollary 3.31. Moreover, even for spheres, there is no universal integer r such that, for every PL triangulation T, $\mathrm{sd}^r T$ is perfect. This is best seen using knot theory:

Proposition 3.18 (Lickorish [Lick91], cf. also Benedetti–Ziegler [BZ11], [Ben12a])**.** *For each integer $r \geq 0$ and for every integer $d \geq 3$, there is a PL d-sphere S such that $\mathrm{sd}^r S$ does not admit any perfect discrete Morse function.*

In fact, one can even show the following (cf. Benedetti [Ben12a]): For every positive integers r, s and d, with $d \geq 3$, there is a PL d-sphere S such that $\mathrm{sd}^r S$ does not admit any discrete Morse function with fewer that s critical $(d-1)$-faces. On these triangulations, the discrete Morse vector is much larger than the Betti vector; in fact, arbitrarily larger (depending on s).

In conclusion, Theorem 3.17 is not algorithmically efficient, as one cannot bound how large r can be.

3.3 Non-PL structures and discrete Morse theory

Say that a topological manifold has both PL and non-PL triangulations. Suppose we want to find the smallest discrete Morse vector, namely, a triangulation with a discrete Morse function with the fewest possible number of critical cells. It is not clear whether we should look among PL triangulations, rather than among non-PL ones. Perhaps a simple observation to keep in mind is that cones are always collapsible; hence cones over non-PL balls yield examples of collapsible, non-PL triangulations. This indicates that non-PL objects might be competitive with PL ones, when it comes to having perfect discrete Morse functions.

The following 5-dimensional example illustrates a more bizarre possibility.

Example 3.19. Consider the smooth contractible 5-manifold M constructed by Adiprasito–Benedetti in [AB11]. This manifold is not homeomorphic to a ball, but it does admit a collapsible triangulation T. Since M is smooth, it admits PL triangulations by Theorem 1.5, but none of these PL triangulations is collapsible. In fact, by applying Theorem 3.7 to the case where D is a point, one obtains immediately that all PL collapsible triangulations have a shellable (iterated barycentric) subdivision. In particular, all PL collapsible manifolds are homeomorphic to balls. But M is not homeomorphic to a ball. In particular, the triangulation T is non-PL.

Hence in the quest for an optimal discrete Morse function, in some cases it is better to look among *non-PL* triangulations. We proceed now to construct the first examples of non-PL triangulations of the 5-sphere that admit a perfect discrete Morse function. The idea for the following construction comes from Karim Adiprasito.

Proposition 3.20. *For every $d \geq 5$, there exists a non-PL triangulation B of the d-ball such that B is collapsible and ∂B is even shellable. In particular, B is not PL, but its boundary is.*

Proof. Let $d \geq 5$. Let M be a PL triangulation of a contractible $(d-1)$-manifold, such that (1) M is not homeomorphic to a ball and (2) the double of M is PL homeomorphic to the standard sphere. Such examples exist: For example, for $d-1=4$, one can take as M an arbitrary triangulation of the Mazur manifold. (For $d-1 \neq 4$, the double of every contractible PL $(d-1)$-manifold is automatically a sphere by Theorem 1.3.)

Let $H = \partial M$ be the boundary of M. This H is a simplicial PL homology 3-sphere. Since M is not a ball, by Corollary 1.2 H is not simply connected. Let p be a new vertex, and let C_0 denote the manifold obtained by gluing the cone $p * H$ to M along their common boundary H. C_0 is not a manifold, but it is a homology-manifold, and has the same homology of a d-sphere. Furthermore C_0 is simply connected, since H is connected. Consider the complex C_1, obtained as the suspension ΣC_0 of C_0. Clearly, C_1 is a homology manifold. Let us examine the links of the vertices of C_1. There are three cases to consider:

(a) If v lies in M, then $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_0)$ is a sphere, hence $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1) = \Sigma \mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_0)$ is a sphere as well. In particular, $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1)$ is simply connected.

(b) If $v = p$ (the apex of the cone), $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1)$ is the suspension of $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_0)$, which is equivalent to H and hence connected. By Seifert–Van Kampen, $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1)$ is simply connected (although it is not a sphere).

(c) If v is one of the apices of the suspension ΣC_0, then $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1) = C_0$. In particular, although it is not a manifold, it is simply connected.

Hence in all cases $\mathrm{Link}\,(v, C_1)$ is simply connected. By the Edwards–Cannon criterion (Theorem 1.11), C_1 is a manifold. It is not PL, though. In fact, if a and b are the apices of the suspension ΣC_0, then the PL-singular set S of C_1 consists of the vertices a, b and p, and of the edges connecting a to p and b to p.

Let us consider the submanifold B of $\mathrm{sd}^2 C_1$ obtained as the union of all faces of $\mathrm{sd}^2 C_1$ intersecting $\mathrm{sd}^2 S$. Then B collapses to S (cf. [Gla70, Lemma III.9 and III.10]), and since S is a tree, and in particular collapsible, so is B. Furthermore, the boundary of B is PL homeomorphic to the double of the contractible manifold M, which is a PL sphere by assumption. Indeed, ∂B is PL homeomorphic to the gluing of $\mathrm{Link}\,(a, C_1) - p \cong M$

and Link $(b, C_1) - p \cong M$ along their common boundary Link $(p, C_1) - \{a\} - \{b\} \cong H$. In particular, by Corollary 1.2, B is a ball. However, B is not a PL ball, since its PL singular set is nonempty. In conclusion, B is a collapsible, non-PL ball, whose boundary is a PL sphere. By Lemma 3.12, every PL sphere becomes shellable after sufficiently many iterated barycentric subdivisions. So, up to replacing B with $\mathrm{sd}^r B$ (for a suitably large r), we can also assume that ∂B is shellable. ☐

Corollary 3.21. *For each $d \geq 5$, some non-PL d-spheres admit perfect discrete Morse functions.*

Proof. Fix $d \geq 5$. Consider the non-PL collapsible d-ball B with PL shellable boundary constructed in Proposition 3.20. Let y be a new vertex, and let

$$S \;=\; \partial(y * B) \;=\; B \cup (y * \partial B).$$

Since ∂B is shellable, so is the ball $B' = (y * \partial B)$. Let Δ' be any facet of B'. Since B' is shellable, B' is also endocollapsible, so $B' - \Delta'$ collapses onto $\partial B = \partial B'$. The same collapsing sequence shows that $S - \Delta'$ collapses onto B. But B is collapsible; so $S - \Delta'$ is collapsible. ☐

Remark 3.22. If C is a collapsible complex, then $\mathrm{sd}C$ collapses to a facet of $\mathrm{sd}C$. Thus, we can modify the construction of Corollary 3.21 to obtain a non-PL 5-sphere S such that $S - \Delta'$ collapses onto another facet Δ''. Let A be the 5-ball $S - \Delta''$. Then, with the same collapsing sequence, $A - \Delta'$ collapses onto $\partial\Delta'' = \partial A$. So A yields an example of an endo-collapsible ball that is not PL.

Now, every PL endo-collapsible manifold has a collapsible barycentric subdivision [Ben12a]. This means that the Ball Theorem in [Ben12a] ("every endo-collapsible manifold is a ball") is more general than Whitehead's result ("every PL collapsible manifold is a ball"), because some endo-collapsible manifolds are not PL.

3.4 Duality, 4-manifolds, and LC triangulations

The Betti numbers of *closed* manifolds are always palindromic, i.e.

$$(\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{d-1}, \beta_d) \;=\; (\beta_d, \beta_{d-1}, \ldots, \beta_1, \beta_0).$$

This is a consequence of Poincaré duality, a well-known property of closed manifolds. In the language of Morse theory, the property can be stated as follows: Suppose a smooth, closed manifold M admits a (generic) smooth function f, with c_i critical points of index i. Then $-f$ is also a (generic) smooth Morse function on M, and it has c_{d-i} critical points of index i.

Corollary 3.23. *Let M be a closed topological manifold.*
(1) *If $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$ is a Morse vector on M, so is $(c_d, c_{d-1}, \ldots, c_1, c_0)$.*
(2) *If $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$ is a PL handle vector on M, so is $(c_d, c_{d-1}, \ldots, c_1, c_0)$.*

There is also a version of Poincaré duality for triangulated manifolds, due to Forman. It involves the notion of *dual block complex* T^* of a triangulation T, for which we refer the reader to Munkres' book [Mun84, p. 377]. The "blocks" forming the complex are PL-homeomorphic to the stars of the faces of T, so they might not be homeomorphic to balls if T is not PL. However, if T is PL, then the dual blocks are balls, and T^* is a regular CW-complex. In particular, the barycentric subdivision of T^* is a simplicial complex, combinatorially equivalent to the barycentric subdivision of T.

Proposition 3.24 (Forman)**.** *Suppose a triangulated, closed manifold M admits a discrete Morse function f, with c_i critical i-faces. Then the dual block complex M^* admits some discrete Morse function with c_{d-i} critical i-faces. (For example, one could choose the function that assigns $-f(\sigma)$ to the dual block of each face σ: This function is usually denoted by $-f$.)*

Corollary 3.25. *Let M be a closed PL manifold. If $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$ is a discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation of M, then so is $(c_d, c_{d-1}, \ldots, c_1, c_0)$.*

Proof. Let T be a PL triangulation admitting the discrete Morse vector $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$. By Proposition 3.24, $(c_d, c_{d-1}, \ldots, c_1, c_0)$ is a discrete Morse vector on T^*, and thus also on $\mathrm{sd}T^* = \mathrm{sd}T$, which is another PL triangulation of M. ☐

Corollary 3.23, Proposition 3.24 and Corollary 3.25 do not extend to manifolds with boundary. For example, $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is the handle vector of the d-ball, but read from right to left it is not a valid handle vector, because it starts with a 0. To extend the idea of duality to manifolds with boundary, one usually uses the notion of (smooth or PL) handle decomposition of a *cobordism*: For details, see Rourke–Sanderson [RS72] or Sharko [Sha93].

In discrete Morse theory, there is a rather direct way to extend duality to manifolds with boundary. This was introduced by the author in [Ben12a]. The idea is this: We consider *boundary-critical* discrete Morse functions, which are discrete Morse functions for which all boundary faces are critical. When it comes to counting critical faces, we simply throw the boundary faces away. Here is the formal definition: A boundary-critical discrete Morse function f has *interior Morse vector* $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$, if f has exactly c_i critical faces in the interior of the manifold.

Proposition 3.26 (Benedetti [Ben12a])**.** *Suppose a PL triangulated manifold M admits a discrete Morse function f, with c_i critical i-faces, and no critical boundary faces in the boundary of M. Then the dual block complex M^* admits a boundary critical discrete Morse function with c_{d-i} critical interior i-faces.*

Similarly, if M admits a boundary-critical discrete Morse function f, with c_i critical interior i-faces, then M^* admits a discrete Morse function with c_{d-i} critical i-faces.

Corollary 3.27. *Let M be a topological manifold. If $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-1}, c_d)$ is a discrete Morse vector (resp. an interior discrete Morse vector) on some PL triangulation of M, then $(c_d, c_{d-1}, \ldots, c_1, c_0)$ is an interior discrete Morse vector (resp. a discrete Morse vector) on some PL triangulation of M.*

Proof. Let T be a PL triangulation admitting a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces (respectively, a boundary-critical discrete Morse function with c_i critical interior i-faces). Here we no longer have that $\mathrm{sd}T^* = \mathrm{sd}T$, so we cannot conclude as in Corollary

3.25. However, since T is PL, all face stars in T are PL balls. Up to replacing T with its r-th barycentric subdivision, we may assume that all face stars in T are shellable balls [AB12]. In particular, all face stars in T are collapsible and endo-collapsible. The conclusion follows then on sd$T$ by [Ben12a, Theorem 3.20]. ☐

As an application, we show that no triangulation of the Mazur manifold is locally constructible, thus answering a question by Živaljević. Locally constructible (shortly, LC) triangulations were studied in [BZ11]; they can be characterized as the triangulations admitting boundary-critical discrete Morse function with 1 critical interior d-face and 0 critical interior $(d-1)$-faces. LC manifolds are always simply connected [Ben10a]. Živaljević conjectured that the converse also holds. Using a result of Wall on geometric connectivity [Wal71], the author proved that every simply connected d-manifold, if $d \neq 4$, admits an LC triangulation [Ben10b]. As the next result shows, the case $d = 4$ is different.

Proposition 3.28. *The Mazur* 4*-manifold admits no LC triangulation.*

Proof. By contradiction, suppose that $(c_0, c_1, c_2, 0, c_4)$ is an interior discrete Morse vector on a triangulation of the manifold. This triangulation is 4-dimensional and thus necessarily PL, by Theorem 1.9. By Corollary 3.27, $(c_4, 0, c_2, c_1, c_0)$ is a discrete Morse vector on some PL triangulation of M. By Theorems 2.14 and 3.1, this means that M has a smooth handle decomposition with handle vector $(c_4, 0, c_2, c_1, c_0)$. But this contradicts a result by Casson, who proved that every smooth handle decomposition of Mazur's manifold must contain 1-handles, cf.[KS77, Problem 4.18]. ☐

This disproves a conjecture by the author in [Ben10b]. The conjecture by Živaljević that all simply-connected manifolds admit LC triangulations, remains open for *closed* 4-manifolds. Via Theorems 2.14 and 3.1, in this specific case the conjecture is equivalent to the long-standing open problem by Kirby of whether every simply-connected closed manifold is geometrically 1-connected [KS77, Problem 4.18].

3.5 The case of 3-manifolds: A characterization of the Heegaard genus

A *handlebody* is a thickened graph in $\mathbb{R}^3$. A *genus-g Heegaard splitting* of a 3-manifold M is a decomposition of M into two handlebodies, glued together at a genus-g surface S_g. The *Heegaard genus* of a 3-manifold is the smallest g for which the manifold has a genus-g Heegaard splitting.

Example 3.29. The full torus is the result of thickening a cycle; hence it is a handlebody. The complement of a full torus inside the 3-sphere is also a full torus. So, the 3-sphere has a genus-1 Heegaard splitting. It has also a genus-0 splitting: The complement of a ball inside the 3-sphere, is a ball. So the Heegaard genus of the sphere is zero.

Heegaard splittings were introduced around 1900 by Heegaard, and later absorbed into the more general language of handle decompositions. In fact, every genus-g handlebody can be viewed as the result of attaching exactly g 1-handles to a 0-handle. Conversely, given a handle decomposition of a cloed 3-manifold with one 0-handle, g 1-handles, g 2-handles, and one 0-handle, this can be viewed as a Heegard splitting: the i-handle with $i \leq 1$ form the first handlebody, the i-handle with $i \geq 2$ form the second "dual" handlebody. By Poincaré duality, the two handlebodies are homeomorphic.

Theorem 3.30. *For a closed connected* 3*-manifold, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *M admits a genus-g Heegaard splitting.*
(ii) *M admits a handle decomposition with c_i i-handles, where $(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3) = (1, g, g, 1)$.*
(iii) *M admits a Morse function with c_i critical points of index i, where $(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3) = (1, g, g, 1)$.*
(iv) *Some triangulation of M admits a discrete Morse function with c_i critical i-faces, $(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3) = (1, g, g, 1)$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is well known and was explained above. The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) was explained in Section 2.2. The new part is the equivalence of (ii) and (iv), which is given by Theorems 3.2 and 3.17, and the fact that all triangulations of 3-manifolds are PL. ☐

Corollary 3.31. *The Heegaard genus $g(M)$ of a closed* 3*-manifold M is the smallest g such that some triangulation of the manifold admits a discrete Morse function with discrete Morse vector $\mathbf{c} = (1, g, g, 1)$.*

This result has two consequences. The first one is algorithmic: Since there is an algorithm to compute the Heegaard genus of a manifold [Li11a], Corollary 3.31 yields an algorithm to determine the best discrete Morse vector over all triangulations. The other way around, the heuristics by Benedetti–Lutz to quickly compute some random discrete Morse vector [Ben12b] yields a heuristic to obtain a Heegaard splitting quickly, albeit with no guarantee of optimality.

The second consequence of Corollary 3.31 is of topological nature. The work by Boileau, Zieschang, Schultens, Weidmann and Li has revealed topological obstructions for the existence of Heegaard splittings of low genus. Recall that $\text{rank}(M)$ is the minimal number of elements needed to generate $\pi_1(M)$. It is easy to see that $\text{rank}(M) \leq g(M)$. In the Sixties, Waldhausen conjectured that equality would hold for all 3-manifolds. The conjecture turned out to be wrong.

Theorem 3.32 (Boileau–Zieschang [BZ84], Schultens–Weidmann [SW07], Li [Li11b])**.** *There are Seifert fibered spaces, graph manifolds, and hyperbolic* 3*-manifolds with rank strictly smaller than the Heegaard genus. In fact, the distance between rank and genus can be arbitrarily high.*

Corollary 3.33. *For every $g > 0$, there is a* 3*-manifold M such that any discrete Morse function on any triangulation of M has more than $g + \text{rank}(M)$ critical edges.*

On these manifolds, *no matter how much we subdivide the triangulation*, no discrete Morse function will be sharp in reading off the homotopy.

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to Karim Adiprasito, who was of fundamental help when writing this paper, and constantly provided great suggestions. Thanks also to Neža Mramor and Ulrich Bauer for stimulating conversations, and to José Alejandro Samper for proofreading the first version.

References

[AB11] K. Adiprasito and B. Benedetti, *Metric geometry and collapsibility*, preprint, `arXiv:1107.5789v2`.

[AB12] K. Adiprasito and B. Benedetti, *Subdivisions, shellability and the Zeeman conjecture*, preprint, `arXiv:1202.6606`.

[Akb10] S. Akbulut, *Cappell-Shaneson homotopy spheres are standard*, Ann. of Math. (2) **171** (2010), no. 3, 2171–2175.

[Ben10a] B. Benedetti, *Collapses, products and LC manifolds*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A (2010), 586–590.

[Ben10b] B. Benedetti, *Discrete Morse theory is at least as perfect as Morse theory*, preprint, `arXiv:1010.0548`.

[Ben12a] B. Benedetti, *Discrete Morse theory for manifolds with boundary*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012), 6631–6670.

[Ben12b] B. Benedetti, *Metric geometry and random discrete Morse theory*, Oberwolfach Reports 24 (2012), to appear. (Report on work in progress with K. Adiprasito and F. H. Lutz.)

[BZ11] B. Benedetti and G. M. Ziegler, *On locally constructible spheres and balls*, Acta Math. **206** (2011), no. 2, 205–243.

[BL00] A. Björner and F. H. Lutz, *Simplicial manifolds, bistellar flips and a 16-vertex triangulation of the Poincaré homology 3-sphere*, Exp. Math. 9 (2000), 275–289.

[BZ84] M. Boileau and H. Zieschang, *Heegaard genus of closed orientable Seifert* 3-*manifolds*, Inventiones Math. 76 (1984), 455–468.

[Buo03] S. Buoncristiano, *Fragments of geometric topology from the Sixties*, vol. 6 of Geometry & Topology Monographs, Coventry (2003).

[Cai61] S. S. Cairns, *A simple triangulation method for smooth manifolds*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **67** (1961), 389–390.

[Can79] J. W. Cannon, *Shrinking cell-like decompositions of manifolds. Codimension three*, Annals of Math. (2), vol. 110 (1979), no. 1, pp. 83-–112.

[Cer68] J. Cerf, *Sur les difféomorphismes de la sphère de dimension trois* ($\Gamma_4 = 0$), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 53, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1968.

[Cer70] J. Cerf, *La stratification naturelle des espaces de fonctions différentiables réelles et le théorème de la pseudo-isotopie*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1970), no. 39, 5–173.

[Edw78] R. D. Edwards, *The topology of manifolds and cell-like maps*, Proc. ICM 1978, Helsinki, 111–127.

[Edw06] R. D. Edwards, *Suspensions of homology spheres*, preprint (publ. 2006, but written around 1978) at `arXiv:math/0610573`.

[For02] R. Forman, *A user's guide to Discrete Morse Theory*, Sem. Lothar. Comb. 48: Art B48c (2002), 35pp.

[Fre82] M. Freedman, *The topology of four-dimensional manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom. 17 (1982), 357–453.

[FGMW10] M. Freedman, R. Gompf, S. Morrison, and K. Walker, *Man and machine thinking about the smooth 4-dimensional Poincaré conjecture*, Quantum Topol. **1** (2010), no. 2, 171–208.

[Gal10] E. Gallais, *Combinatorial realization of the Thom–Smale complex via discrete Morse theory*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Classe di Scienze (5) 9, No. 2 (2010), 229–252.

[Gla70] L. C. Glaser, *Geometrical combinatorial topology I*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1970.

[Gom10] R. E. Gompf, *More Cappell-Shaneson spheres are standard*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **10** (2010), no. 3, 1665–1681.

[Goo68] R. E. Goodrick, *Non-simplicially collapsible triangulations of* I^n, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **64** (1968), 31–36.

[GS80] D. E. Galewski and R. J. Stern, *Classification of simplicial triangulations of topological manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **111** (1980), no. 1, 1–34.

[HM74] M. W. Hirsch and B. Mazur, *Smoothings of piecewise linear manifolds*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1974, Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 80.

[HS70] W. Hsiang and J. L. Shaneson, *Fake tori*, Topology of Manifolds (Proc. Inst., Univ. of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 1969), Markham, Chicago, Ill., 1970, pp. 18–51.

[JM09] G. Jerše and N. Mramor Kosta, *Ascending and descending regions of a discrete Morse function*, Comput. Geom. 42 (2009), 639–651.

[Ker60] M. A. Kervaire, *A manifold which does not admit any differentiable structure*, Comment. Math. Helv. **34** (1960), 257–270.

[KM63] M. A. Kervaire and J. W. Milnor, *Groups of homotopy spheres. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **77** (1963), 504–537.

[KS77] R. C. Kirby, *Problems in low-dimensional topology.* In Geometric Topology, W. Kanez ed., AMS, 1997, 35–473. An updated version is maintained at the website `math.berkeley.edu/~kirby/`.

[KS77] R. C. Kirby and L. C. Siebenmann, *Foundational essays on topological manifolds, smoothings, and triangulations*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1977.

[Li11a] T. Li, *An algorithm to determine the Heegaard genus of a 3-manifold*, Geom. Topol. **15** (2011), no. 2, 1029–1106.

[Li11b] T. Li, *Rank and genus of 3-manifolds*, preprint, `arXiv:1106.6302`.

[Lick91] W. B. R. Lickorish, *Unshellable triangulations of spheres*, Europ. J. Combin., 12 (1991), 527–530.

[Mat02] Y. Matsumoto, *An introduction to Morse theory*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 208, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[Mil09] J. Milnor, *Differential topology forty-six years later*, in Notices of the AMS, vol. 58 (2011) 804–809.

[Mil09] J. Milnor, *Fifty years ago: topology of manifolds in the 50's and 60's*, in Low Dimensional Topology, vol. 15 of IAS / Park City Mathematics Series, AMS (2009), 7–20.

[Mil63] J. Milnor, *Morse theory*, Based on lecture notes by M. Spivak and R. Wells. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 51, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1963.

[Mil56] J. Milnor, *On manifolds homeomorphic to the* 7*-sphere*, Ann. of Math. (2) **64** (1956), 399–405.

[Moi52] E. E. Moise, *Affine structures in* 3*-manifolds. V. The triangulation theorem and Hauptvermutung*, Ann. of Math. (2) **56** (1952), 96–114.

[Mor25] M. Morse, *Relations between the critical points of a real function of* n *independent variables*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 27 (1925), 345–396.

[Mun84] J. R. Munkres, *Elements of algebraic topology*, Addison–Wesley, Menlo Park (1984).

[Mun60] J. R. Munkres, *Obstructions to the smoothing of piecewise-differentiable homeomorphisms*, Ann. of Math. (2) **72** (1960), 521–554.

[Pac87] U. Pachner, *Konstruktionsmethoden und das kombinatorische Homöomorphieproblem für Triangulationen kompakter semilinearer Mannigfaltigkeiten*, Abh. Math. Sem. Hamb. 57 (1987), 69–86.

[Per02] G. Perelman, *The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications*, preprint (2002) at `arxiv:math/0211159`.

[Ran96] A. A. Ranicki, *On the Hauptvermutung*, The Hauptvermutung book, K-Monogr. Math., vol. 1, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1996, pp. 3–31.

[Rat06] J. G. Ratcliffe, *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*, Springer Verlag, 2006.

[Rie53] B. Riemann, *Gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1953.

[Rok52] V. A. Rokhlin, *New results in the theory of four-dimensional manifolds*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) **84** (1952), 221–224.

[RS72] C. P. Rourke and B. J. Sanderson, *Introduction to piecewise-linear topology*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[SW07] J. Schultens and R. Weidmann, *On the geometric and the algebraic rank of graph 3-manifolds*, Pacific J. Math. 231 (2007), 481–510.

[Sha93] V. V. Sharko, *Functions on manifolds: Algebraic and topological aspects*, Transcr. Math. Monographs 131, AMS, 1993.

[Sma62] S. Smale, *On the structure of manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. 84 (1962), 387–399.

[Sta62] J. Stallings, *The piecewise-linear structure of Euclidean space.* Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58 (1962), 481—488.

[Wal71] C. T. C. Wall, *Geometrical connectivity I & II.* J. London Math. Soc. 3 (1971), 597–608.

[Whi61] J. H. C. Whitehead, *Manifolds with transverse fields in euclidean space*, Ann. of Math. (2) **73** (1961), 154–212.

[Zee61] E. C. Zeeman, *The generalised Poincaré conjecture.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 67, 270.

[Zee66] E. C. Zeeman, *Seminar on combinatorial topology.*, Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques 1963. Chap. 1-6; Chap. 7, (1965); Chap. 8, Paris, 1966.